LIVING LEADERS

LUCIUS H. BUGBEE

CT
120
B84
1923
GTU
Storage

R A Stubbs

from

Mrs Lydia Lallin

Xmas '23

I take pleasure in

passing it on to his

relative

Revd Frank Bugbee

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2026

https://archive.org/details/livingleadersjud0000unse

LIVING LEADERS

Judged by Christian Standards

By
LUCIUS H. BUGBEE

THE ABINGDON PRESS
NEW YORK CINCINNATI

G

CT
120
B84
1923

Copyright, 1923, by
LUCIUS H. BUGBEE

Printed in the United States of America

b13901886

CONTENTS

		PAGE
	FOREWORD	5
I.	GANDHI	7
II.	CLEMENCEAU	20
III.	LENIN	33
IV.	COUÉ	50
V.	LLOYD GEORGE	65
VI.	EINSTEIN	80
	BIBLIOGRAPHY	95

FOREWORD

CAREFULLY preserved in the vaults of the Treasury Building at Washington are certain weights and measures whose accuracy has been scientifically determined. They are standards by which the weights and measures of the nation can be tested and corrected.

In the Christian outlook upon life some of us believe with increasing conviction that we have a standard by which the faith and conduct of the world must ultimately be determined. If this conviction is sometimes stated with the arrogance of certainty, it is because we believe there are in the Christian gospel universal elements that must ultimately reconcile all warring creeds, codes, and interests and dominate the thinking of the world to the exclusion of lower and more provincial ideals of life.

This is not the same world in which we lived ten years ago. Its physical features may remain the same, but the ideas

and ideals are changing. We are turning a corner in human history and few indeed can prophesy with any definiteness just what lies before us. Nothing is more characteristic of these troubled days of transition than the wistful longing for leadership; for some one who sees more clearly than the rest of us where we are going and who will lead us out of our provincialisms and our prejudices into the promised land of peace and mutual good will.

In response to that desire many leaders have arisen. Some of them command attention for a brief time; others have gained a more enduring fame. It was our purpose in these addresses, prepared in the midst of a busy pastorate for Sunday evening congregations, to bring several of the living leaders of present-day thought and life to the test of Christian standards that we might see how nearly they measure up to what we believe will be the final norm of judgment.

L. H. B.

Hennepin Avenue Church,
Minneapolis, Minn.

I

GANDHI

One of the strongest forces liberated by the events of the last few years is the desire for national self-expression; the struggle on the part of hitherto subject races to express their own individuality. This is the basis of the breakup of those older and larger political units of Central Europe and the resulting birth of a number of new national groups. The British Empire has been profoundly moved by this throbbing passion for nationalism. So much so that we are now told that the familiar phrase, "The British Empire," is to pass out of political history, its place to be taken by "The British Commonwealth of Nations," a change which in itself is indicative of the power of this force. Egypt and Ireland have recently asserted themselves; Canada, Australia, and South Africa had already done so, and India is throb-

bing with this passion for national self-expression.

All this discontent and restless yearning, so far as India is concerned, is embodied in the person of Mohandus K. Gandhi. Before we speak of him in detail, let us try to get the Indian point of view.

In America we have something more than one hundred millions of people. In India there are more than three hundred and fifteen millions. An American journeys to Boston, visits Bunker Hill and Lexington, takes a glimpse at Plymouth Rock and feels that he has come very close to the beginnings of his country's history. But the thoughtful Indian traces his history back more than thirty times as far. He points with pride to emperors and scholars who were in their prime two thousand years before our ancestors in northern Europe had ceased to eat roots and nuts and to clothe themselves in the skins of animals. He is quite willing to admit the value of the practical gifts which characterize our Western genius, but he believes that in

the genius of his people there are qualities of equal value, such as patience, power of deep and concentrated thought, a mastery of minutiæ and detail which are quite as necessary to the world's life as our Western inventiveness and push. He is humiliated when he remembers that his three hundred and fifteen millions of people, with their rich possible contributions to the world's life, are dominated by a few thousand foreign officials.

Mr. Gandhi is the incarnation of this spirit of Indian unrest. His own people call him "Mahatma"—"Great-Souled One." Carlisle said that Dante was the voice of the Middle Ages. So Gandhi is the voice of modern India. In him the youth of India have found a national hero whose record is so unstained and whose soul is so free from anger, envy, or pride that they already feel for him the reverence which the Italian youth feel for Mazzini and Garibaldi, or American youth for Washington and Lincoln. Stevenson says somewhere of certain people that "their coming is as if another

candle had been lighted." Gandhi has certainly lighted a candle in India which is not likely to go out.

Who is Gandhi? He is a small, spare man, weighing less than ninety pounds, with close-cropped, iron-gray hair and eyes that seem to read the inmost souls of those with whom he comes in contact. He was born fifty-three years ago in the northern part of the presidency of Bombay. He was the son of a wealthy Hindu merchant and his early education was by tutors in his father's house. At the age of fifteen he was sent to England and there he remained till after he was twenty-five. He received the best of educational advantages, studied law in London and was admitted to practice. After graduation he returned to Bombay. Some say that he was even then a disillusionized man, thoroughly disappointed with what he found in Western civilization.

In the practice of his profession as a lawyer there are some things that remind one strongly of Abraham Lincoln. You will remember that on one occasion Lincoln was trying a case before a district

judge in Illinois when it developed that his client was clearly guilty. He promptly left the courtroom and went over to his hotel. When the judge, wishing to go on with the trial, summoned him, he sent back word that he was washing his hands and could not and would not return. Similarly, on more than one occasion, Gandhi dropped a case when he discovered that his client had deceived him or was clearly guilty. He despised trickery and meanness. Ultimately he abandoned the practice of his profession, but before doing so he became involved in the defense of certain Indians in South Africa.

Previous to this time large numbers of Indian coolies had been taken to South Africa as cheap labor in the industries supported by British capital. Their position there was somewhat similar to that of the Japanese on our Western coast. They excited the antagonism and contempt of the natives. The friction ran so high that thousands of them were sentenced to expulsion from the country. In their extremity they appealed to

Gandhi. He espoused their cause and after a legal fight stayed the act of expulsion. Then he began a unique movement. It was really a strike based upon nonresistance, a principle to which Gandhi has consistently adhered throughout his life. He took up land outside the city of Durbar. His fellow countrymen were quietly withdrawn from the industries and placed on the land. This, of course, crippled business and excited resentment which was directed primarily upon Gandhi, the leader of the movement. On one occasion he was mobbed and left for dead. He was thrown into prison. He bore it all with marvelous equanimity.

Then the Boer War broke out and Gandhi, true to his principle, repaid good for evil by organizing at once an Indian ambulance corps with which he did such valiant service at the front that he was commended and decorated by the governor-general. But when the war closed he was again thrust into prison.

After twelve years or more of this quiet but persistent movement, he won a com-

plete victory for the Indians in South Africa and they were accorded their just rights by the government.

The opening of the World War found Gandhi in London. He immediately formed another Indian ambulance corps and when the first Indian troops reached France they found Gandhi and his unit there to welcome them. During this period, however, his health was weakened and he returned to India. Once more he was bitterly disappointed in the outcome of Western civilization as shown by the hatreds and havoc of the war. He believed that India had a better way to teach humanity and he was humiliated by the subject condition of his people. India herself was stirred with discontent and with longing for nationalism. The Punjab Massacres, a fatal blunder of British administration, added to the general restlessness. The Mohammedan portion of the population was disturbed by the Caliphilate situation. Gandhi was the man of the hour. He unified Hindus and Mohammedans who hitherto had had little in common. Clothed in the rough

home-spun blankets of his people, with bare head and bare feet, he traveled throughout India preaching freedom with a disinterested sincerity which aroused millions of the people.

A New Road to Freedom

This freedom was to be obtained by the application of the principle of non-resistance or noncooperation as it came to be called politically. It involved a gigantic boycott of the British government in India. Hindu parents were to withdraw their children from government schools and organize their own institutions. Hindu officers were to resign. Those who had disputes at law were not to use the regularly appointed judicial machinery but settle their disputes among themselves. They were to abstain from taking part in public functions or from buying goods from English merchants. It was a new way of starting a revolution. It was sufficiently effective to cause the government great concern. For some time Gandhi was at liberty but was finally apprehended, given a public trial,

in which he pleaded guilty, and was sentenced to prison. What the final outcome will be no one can yet say. Gandhi in prison is still the leader of the intellectuals of India though the masses of the people are somewhat disappointed because he failed to be the wonder-worker and miracle-man that they expected. In this Gandhi is not unlike Jesus, who disappointed the people because he would not give them a sign.

Now, let us bring this unusual figure to the test of the Christian standards to which we have before referred. Notice that the freedom which Gandhi preached is to be achieved not by force nor bloodshed. He is reported to have said that he would not wish the freedom of India if it cost the blood of a single Englishman. It is to be achieved by the silent revolution of nonresistance, or as Gandhi prefers to call it, returning good for evil. This is a distinctly Christian principle. When the Indian leader was asked where he found the source of his ideas he replied: "In the Sermon on the Mount. When I read such statements as these,

'Resist not the evil man. Love your enemies. Bless them that curse you. Do good to them that spitefully use you and persecute you that you may become the children of your father in heaven,' I felt that my ideas were confirmed where I least expected it." One who was intimate with Gandhi tells us that the only picture which hung upon the walls of his room was Holman Hunt's picture of Christ entitled "The Light of the World." Others tell us that Gandhi has an inner circle to whom he submits many of his plans, all three of whom are Christians. While some feel that he is one of the most dangerous men in India, others reply that his doctrines are no more dangerous than are those of the New Testament. To be sure, he is making a political application of ideas from the Sermon on the Mount, but who will dare to assume that Christ meant those principles to be applied only in the narrower sphere of personal relationships.

Again, like Jesus, Gandhi emphasizes the supreme importance of spiritual values as over against our materialistic

civilization. He abhors our Western industrialism. The pressure of our competing business life, the multiplication of luxury and wealth destroys simplicity and breaks down ideals. It puts in the wrong place the emphasis which should be on soul values. He is, therefore, opposed to the present economic order and regards himself and his people as missionaries with a message to the West. Did not Jesus himself say that "a man's life consisteth not in the abundance of the things which he possesseth"? Did he not ask so earnestly, "What shall it profit a man if he gain the whole world and lose his own soul?" When we hear Gandhi urging his people to be willing to lose all that they might gain everything, it sounds very much like Jesus Christ urging his followers to risk everything in the great adventure of the spirit.

But Gandhi has not yet followed Jesus to the ultimate goal of the Master's teaching. He is thinking primarily in terms of India and of the freedom of his own race. Jesus is thinking in terms of all mankind and the freedom of every human

soul. The world was in Christ's thought as it is not in the mind of any of our modern leaders. In his mission to humanity he rose above the bounds of race or clan or color. "Who is my mother, my sister, my brother?" he said to those who called his attention to family obligations, and answered his own question by the statement "Whosoever doeth the will of my Father who is in heaven, he is my brother, my sister, and my mother."

In Christianity there is no room for our narrow, national egotisms and our racial prejudices. Self-determination, though it may be the present slogan of the awakening of large groups of people, is too narrow a term to be included in the terminology of the kingdom of God. There is no room therein for Ku Klux Klan or any other movement that has for its creed the dominance of the white race. Jesus himself was not a Caucasian. It was not a white face that looked out upon the people in the synagogues of Galilee or from the hillsides by the Lake. The white race is only one third of the human family, and there is no warrant in

the teaching of the New Testament for the domination of two thirds by one third. There is no room here for the dictatorship of the proletariat or the dictatorship of capital. From the Christian viewpoint there is only "one big union" and that is a world-brotherhood according to Christ.

Only in this universal brotherhood will we find the solution of all the trying and tangled situations of the present period of unrest. Pride of family, pride of race and patriotism, all of which have served their purposes as valuable and stimulating ideals, must ultimately give way to the Christian world-brotherhood, and in proportion as Gandhi is really leading India toward this larger consciousness of human solidarity is he approximating the spirit of the Master whose principles he has preached with such effectiveness.

II

CLEMENCEAU

Georges Benjamin Clemenceau has never lost his interest in the United States, where he spent four years during his young manhood. Thomas Jefferson, he thinks, is our greatest statesman, originality is our chief American characteristic and Cooper's story, *The Last of the Mohicans,* is our greatest piece of literature.

That last statement is a key to the interpretation of Clemenceau's character. He is still and always will be the fighter who loves the story of our Indian warriors.

In our last discussion the thought centered in a Hindu leader whose home is on the other side of the world, but tonight we are concerned with one whose leadership is identified with France, our neighbor, our long-time friend, and recent ally.

It is always easier and safer to discuss an interest which is far away than one which is close at hand. The nearer we approach ourselves and our own interests, the more sensitive we become. It is quite likely that I may say some things in this discussion with which you do not agree and may leave unsaid some things which others would wish to hear. But you will at least credit me with an honest effort to bring another of these living leaders of our present thought and life to the test of Christian standards. I wish to remind you that our purpose is not political or partisan. It is primarily ethical and religious. I am simply trying to do what I believe the best thought of the world will be compelled to do; that is, to test its ideas and its conduct by these final principles of Christian living.

I have chosen Clemenceau as the subject of study because he represents a certain type of thought and political action which is just now dominant in France and, indeed, in other nations of Europe. First, let us endeavor to get the French background. The war is over and there

is no need of reviving at this time those issues and controversies which stirred the blood of the world to the boiling point a few years ago. We are too near to this tragic conflict to render an unbiased judgment upon its motives, causes and effects. History will take care of that and in its own good time will pronounce the verdict. Nothing that you or I may think or say now will affect that final verdict of history one jot or one tittle. Through it all, however, France has played a certain part and displayed a certain spirit. That spirit for the most part we have admired and commended. We can only hope that France will not disappoint her best friends in this particular.

There are in the French character admirable qualities. I am not speaking now so much of the Frenchmen whom we see at Paris but of the average rural and provincial citizens who, after all, make up the backbone of any country. In France particularly they constitute the bulk of the population. This average Frenchman has a power of patient endurance, a capacity for uncomplaining self-sacri-

fice, a quiet, stubborn persistence which leaves him undefeated even in the face of most serious difficulties. This triumphant spirit of France has risen out of the physical ruin and material loss which devastated the best one third of the nation's resources. No one can withhold admiration for the way in which these people have gone to work without complaint to retrieve their losses.

But the average Frenchman is also a bit mercenary. He has a thrifty love of money and of goods. He has an instinctive passion for getting and holding. Mr. Clemenceau himself has said that the average rural Frenchman measures all values in terms of property and possessions. He is like the prosperous English farmer who excites Tennyson's scorn when he tells us that the very hoofbeats of his horses as he rides to town along the smooth, hard roads, sing a song of "Property, Property, Property."

This attitude has entered into the French demands for excessive reparations. At the insistence of the French, a sum has been demanded of Germany

which, in the view of unbiased financiers and economists, is beyond all possibility of payment. Notice I do not say beyond the havoc and ruin which has been wrought in France. That can never be paid in gold marks or in any other coinage. Those who determined the policies of the Central Powers of Europe have something to straighten out before Almighty God and the conscience of humanity which they will never be able to pay for in money. But speaking now from a purely practical point of view, the sum total asked of Germany seems to be out of all reason or possibility of payment. France, therefore, finds herself at the present moment under the necessity of trying to collect by force a debt which does not seem possible of payment save by the practical enslavement of the debtor nation, and in this exacting policy she has isolated herself from the sympathy of her best friends.

All this is summed up and embodied in the personal leadership of Mr. Clemenceau. He, more than any other, is responsible for the Treaty which embodied

these impossible demands and for the policy based upon these demands.

Georges Benjamin Clemenceau was born September 28, 1841, in La Vendee, a village looking out on the stormy waters of the Bay of Biscay. He may be truly said to be the combined product of reaction against royalist and ecclesiastical France, for the one made him, and his father before him, a radical in politics, and the other made them free-thinkers and skeptics in religion.

His father was a physician, practicing gratuitously among the peasants in the surrounding country, but chiefly interested in the republican political movements of the day. When the boy was ten years old the father was thrown into prison at the instigation of the Royalists because of his radical activities. This perhaps had its influence in intensifying the radicalism of the son. In 1860 the boy went to Paris to continue his studies in medicine. With youthful enthusiasm he plunged into the political ferment. He was arrested for shouting on the streets: "Long live the Republic!" and he

himself had a bitter taste of royalist oppression.

When he was released from prison he went to England for a short visit and then came to the United States. He began practicing medicine in New York with indifferent results and finally accepted a position as a teacher of French and history in an academy at Stamford, Connecticut. Here he wooed and won an American wife, from whom he was separated twenty years later. Political developments at home called him back to Paris in 1870.

Like his father, he began practicing medicine gratuitously in the section of the capital inhabited by the poorer people and laboring classes. He became their fiery champion. They in turn elected him mayor of their municipality. This gave him his opportunity for entrance into public life. During the terrible days of the Commune he was numbered among the radicals, although it should be said that he was not radical enough to suit the most extreme. He witnessed the humiliation of his country

by the Franco-Prussian War. As a member of the National Assembly he voted with the minority to continue the war against Germany. From this time on he foresaw the coming of another storm and urged upon his country adequate preparation for the event.

I do not know how early in his career he won the title of "The Tiger" by which he is so commonly known to-day, but it might well have been from the beginning. From the first his leadership of the radical element in the National Assembly was conceded. His sudden and terrific attacks upon the government were dreaded by his opponents. His motto seemed to be that of the Yankee horse trader, David Harum, "Do unto others as they would do unto you, and do it first."

There is no law of libel in France, and Clemenceau has used this freedom without mercy against his opponents. In our hottest political campaigns in America nothing has ever approached the unbridled language and vehement outbursts with which he attacked his enemies. He was driven out of the National Assembly

in 1893 because of scandals connected with the Panama Canal. He was falsely accused of receiving money. He turned at once to other pursuits, becoming author and editor, but there was no let-up in his criticism of the government. He is credited with the fall of at least eighteen French Cabinets. He could not be easily induced to accept office, but twice he has been premier, the last time during those critical years in which the World War was finally brought to a triumphant issue. His personality undoubtedly dominated the Peace Council of Versailles and dictated in no small measure the terms of the Treaty.

Mr. Clemenceau is another example of the radical of to-day who becomes the conservative of to-morrow. In the earlier part of his career he was closely allied with the socialists, but to-day the socialist party in France is his most bitter enemy. Although he has consistently stood for justice and truth and has often championed the rights of the oppressed, the compelling passion of his life has been his loyalty to France. He is

not in any sense a sentimentalist except where his own country is concerned. Skeptic as he is in all else, he believes in France with all his mind and soul and strength.

Clemenceau and Christianity

How does the leadership of Mr. Clemenceau appear in the light of Christian standards? To begin with, I think it is fair to say that he has never had the Christian point of view. From the beginning he has been a thoroughgoing materialist in his philosophical conceptions. He is commonly classed among the freethinkers. To be sure, in these later days there have been some evidences of a change of attitude. It was said of the poet Heine that in his later years a sort of heavenly homesickness fell upon him. It would be scarcely true to say that anything of this sort has happened to Clemenceau, although he is credited with saying that atheism, after all, is the proof of a second-rate mind, and that even though we do not know God we should suspect his presence. But there is no

evidence that he has ever been interested in the teaching of Jesus or sympathetic with his principles. Meekness, humility, and peacemaking have no place in his category.

His philosophic viewpoint has, of course, reacted upon his whole political career and determined in large measure his policies. Apparently, it was his materialism which dominated the Peace Conference. There was no basis put forward for mutual understanding in the discussion. A groundwork for permanent peace was not assumed at all. It was a sordid struggle for preeminence of interests among nations. The outcome is the best evidence of this fact. Those who wistfully hoped for a great and noble outcome of this conference were doomed to disappointment. The spirit of Christianity was debarred from the Council of Versailles.

This same general attitude toward life has made Mr. Clemenceau a destructive rather than a constructive force in the public life of France and Europe. In the art of destructive political criticism

he was a master. For the process of tearing down he had terrific powers. He was extremely aggressive in his fight against opponents, but he could not build with equal success. He seems to know nothing of the positive forces of love and good will in public life. At least he cannot use them successfully. He does not believe that destructive warfare will ever cease among men. It is to him a biological necessity.

Christianity, on the other hand, is always constructive. Its emphasis is not upon criticism but upon building and it ever seeks to set in motion positive forces of righteousness. Indeed, the only influences that are making for the redemption of Europe at the present time are those silent forces of beneficence and good will which are working quietly beneath the disturbed political surface in an effort to rebuild the structure of faith and confidence which was so completely destroyed by the war.

By this standard Mr. Clemenceau is weighed and found wanting. It follows as a matter of course that his material-

istic point of view, combined with his one passion for France has given him a narrow outlook as a statesman. He is thinking primarily in terms of the permanence and prosperity of his own country. He is anxious for a defensive alliance with England and America because it will insure the stability of France. He insists upon the full amount of the reparations from Germany even though it means the practical enslavement of that people. If you should attempt to discuss with him the concept of a world-brotherhood, based upon love and good will, he would answer in the words of Shakespeare, "Now we're in the realm, I ween, of enchantment and of dream."

The Tiger of France, in spite of all his radical republican beginnings, is a statesman of the old school, in which material forces and national interest are primary principles. France and all Europe are still waiting for the leadership of a greater statesman who, like Christ, shall have the world in his thought and the redemption of all men as his objective.

III

LENIN

Facts about conditions in Russia are hard to obtain. Reports of observers are widely divergent. Each one sees apparently what he wants to see rather than what really is. The information received through the dispatches in the daily press is particularly untrustworthy. On the face of it much is sent out purely for propaganda purposes. For example, some months ago the story went the rounds of our daily papers to the effect that during the four years since the Revolution the Soviet government had executed one million, seven hundred and sixty-eight thousand, four hundred and eighteen people. Any thoughtful analysis of such a figure would have indicated its falsehood. It would mean that over a thousand people had been shot every day for four years and that the population of fifteen such cities as Duluth or Schenectady had been practically wiped out of existence. This is unbeliev-

able. On the other hand, Captain Hibben, who knows Russia, who was there before the war and has been there since in connection with American Relief work, tells us that less than fifteen thousand people have actually suffered the death penalty at the hands of the government during the four years, and many of these were criminals and thugs.

Again, we have been repeatedly assured through the daily papers that religion in Russia was taboo, that priests had been massacred, churches desecrated, and many of the exercises of religion forbidden. Another American Relief worker reports recently that he found the churches full and overflowing, religious processions on the streets were unmolested, and the churches were unharmed except for their accumulations of useless jewels and ornaments which the government has taken ostensibly for famine relief. A Methodist bishop who returned a few weeks ago from Russia declares that he found the authorities at Moscow friendly, courteous, and not opposed to religious activities, except as

they kept the people in ignorance and superstition.[1]

These incidents illustrate the difficulty of securing accurate information. Indeed, Russia has always been a land of mystery. Its vast territorial spaces stretching away into the unknown heart of Europe and of Asia, its unnumbered millions of dark people living in ignorance and poverty, its undeveloped resources—the industrial age of machinery and organization was only just beginning in Russia before the war; its meager means of communication have all combined to make it an unknown quantity so far as our Western knowledge is concerned.

The one thing that we do know with some assurance is that the old regime in Russia was unspeakably corrupt, tyrannical, and oppressive. Some of us remember with what indignation and resentment we read the articles by George Kennan on Russia and its Siberian exile system, published in this country thirty

[1] This paragraph was written prior to the execution of Vicar-General Butchkavitch.—Editor.

years ago: vast landed estates in the hands of the nobility; dense ignorance among the masses of the people who, though they had been technically freed from serfdom, were still practically bound to the land.

The gradual weakening of a corrupt and incompetent government, undermined by treachery, intrigue, and fear; the growing spirit of revolt among the people; then finally the debt, burden, and exactions of the war for which Russia was totally unprepared, all combined to bring down the structure of government in ruins about the heads of the people. It did not deserve to continue. It perished as the result of its own inherent cruelty and weakness. It has drifted away with the other wreckage of the war and no one, outside of a few interested members of the nobility, wishes for its return.

Russia was politically ripe for the revolution. All classes apparently felt that anything was better than the old regime. It was the supreme opportunity for some strong leader with sound judgment

and good sense. Kerensky tried it and failed. With all his eloquence and emotion, his dramatic and picturesque personality, he failed to grip the mind of the Russian people or to command the situation. He too was submerged by the waves of unrest.

Then came Nicolai Lenin, with his clear, cold mentality, without emotion or feeling or gift of oratory, but with every detail of his plan carefully thought out.

He is a short, fat figure, bearded and bald-headed, without any of that fascination which we usually associate with magnetic leaders, but he possesses an irresistible power of logical reasoning. If you accept his premises, you are almost compelled to admit his conclusions. By the sheer force of his ideas he mastered Russia. He out-saw and out-analyzed all the other nondescript leaders of the revolutionary movement. He gradually eclipsed them and became the practical dictator of the new government. Whatever we may think about him or his ideas, we are forced in all honesty to admit that he is one of the greatest personalities that

have come out of the terrible days through which the world has been passing in recent years.

Before we go on to speak of Lenin more particularly we need to remind ourselves of a few facts about the Russian people which explain the readiness and apparent satisfaction with which they have accepted the Soviet government. The people of Russia are inherently responsive to cooperation and to the feeling of social solidarity. They are not naturally individualistic as we are in America. We have been trained to think and act for ourselves. But the Russian people have been taught to let others do their thinking for them while they act in the mass according to direction and command.

Moreover, cooperative institutions have existed among the people for many years. They have been developed far more widely than in any other country. Then, too, for generations Russia has been essentially communistic. The peasants have worked the land in common and owned in common cattle, horses, and the simple instruments of agricultural production. It is

not at all unnatural that they should take readily to a Communist form of government which is abhorrent to us.

It should be remembered too that the Soviet is not a new idea in Russia. The soviet, or council, around which various trades and occupations are organized, was an instrument ready to hand for more extensive political use.

The Man

Into such a field already sown with the seeds of revolution and Communism came Nicolai Lenin. Who was he? To begin with, let us have his right name, for Lenin is simply one of several aliases which he has used in connection with editorial and authorship work in the Communist movement. His real name is Vladimir Illyich Ulianov. He was born April 10, 1870, in Sinbirsk, a province on the Volga river. He is sometimes called the son of a peasant and again the son of a nobleman. Both statements are perfectly correct. Under the old regime, anyone who became councilor of state was entitled to the rank of nobility. His father came originally

from peasant stock, but he rose to official position as a councilor of state in the department of public education. Always interested in educational matters he became an inspector of government schools. His mother had a small estate of her own in the province of Kazan. There were five children in the family—three boys and two girls. Intellectual pursuits and interests were of primary concern in the family life. It was a happy and comfortable home, in striking contrast with the homes of poverty and ignorance among the surrounding peasants.

It was not unnatural that all the children of this brilliant family should become interested in the social and political improvement of the people.

In 1886 the oldest brother, who had been attending the University in Saint Petersburg, was convicted of participating in a Terrorist plot and was executed with four companions. Lenin was seventeen at this time and the tragic event must have made a deep impression on his own mind and more strongly inclined his own purpose toward revolu-

tion. A little later he himself was expelled from the University of Kazan for making socialistic speeches. Meanwhile he had begun to write and think along these lines. In 1897 he was arrested and sent to Siberia.

After fulfilling a brief term of exile, he returned to Europe to give himself definitely to propagandist work. He lived successively in Paris, Brussels, and London, and finally settled in Geneva. He married a young woman of revolutionary sympathies who became his secretary and helper. In 1903 there was a split in the ranks of the Communists over policies, and Lenin became the recognized leader of the Bolsheviki, a term which means simply the majority as against the Menshiviki, who represented the minority. For many years he was busy writing, publishing, editing, and thinking out meanwhile every detail of a plan which involved seizing the control of government by the radicals. At the outbreak of the war he was in Austria and in 1917, when the old regime collapsed in Russia, he, together with a whole train-load of

revolutionists, were permitted, if not encouraged, by the German government to pass through central Europe and enter Russia. It was not long before the superior mind of Lenin dominated the chaotic situation and established the Soviet government.

Roughly speaking, there are four foundation stones of Nicolai Lenin's thinking. The first is the Communistic state in which the centralized government owns and organizes all means and instruments of production and distribution. The second is his belief in class warfare—the irreconcilable interests of capital and labor. Capital is the eternal enemy. It has nothing in common with labor and must be ruthlessly destroyed throughout the world by an international uprising of workers. Third: He is intensely anti-democratic. He does not believe in the rule of the majority. The majority do not know what is good for them. In some of Lenin's remarks concerning the unenlightened masses there is the same scorn and contempt which characterized the remark of the Pharisees—"These people

who know not the law are accursed." It is the rule of the intelligent and enlightened minority in which he is interested. They are to determine and dictate that which is for the best interests of the majority. Fourth: he recognizes no allegiance to what we call moral obligations. Morality is merely the sanctions and customs forced upon us by the ruling classes. The Communistic state is beyond good and evil.

It is therefore quite natural that under his leadership the present government of Russia should be indifferent if not actually hostile to religion. It is in religious institutions that the moral sanctions of society are headed up. There is doubtless some exaggeration in the reports of anti-religious demonstrations carried on by young Russia at the recent Christmas season. However, it would be only a logical outcome of the prevailing views of Lenin and his followers.

The same may be said of his attitude toward the integrity of the family. We regard it as a fundamental institution. He does not share our notions of sex mo-

rality or the ethics of the family. The nationalization of women in Russia has not been authorized, nor is it ever likely to be. Public opinion will not tolerate it. Yet this, too, would be a logical outcome of his views. In short, our accepted moral distinctions are not in his thinking. Anything is good which advances the interests of the Communistic state. Anything is evil which hinders or prevents it.

Lenin versus Jesus

Now, we are concerned to ask how Lenin and his ideas appear when they are judged by the standard of Christian principles. Has he anything in common with Christ in his philosophy? At the beginning of his interest in social reformation, I have no doubt he had. Perhaps he was moved by something of the same compassion for the multitudes which animated Jesus when he saw them "as sheep without a shepherd" and when he resented the tyranny and injustice of those who "bound heavy burdens and laid them upon men's shoulders." But that

compassionate human interest, if ever possessed, has apparently been frozen out of Lenin's nature. His pitiless logic has congealed all emotion and sentiment. This, to my mind, is his chief weakness. He is one-sided. He is all mind. The impulses of the heart have been stifled. He has only a theoretical interest in men, not a human interest. If he were brought face to face with a real vital human problem, I do not know that he could meet it. Theoretical problems he delights to deal with. He thinks of men more in the abstract than in the concrete. It is not, therefore, at all surprising that his theories have had to be readjusted to actual conditions. It is, of course, to his credit that he sees the necessity of such readjustment, but his retreat is strategic rather than real, and he still hopes to realize theories which are based upon abstract reasoning rather than actual human experience.

Take, for instance, his internationalism and his desire for a world-revolution. Working men have not responded to it. Even the average Russian is not enthu-

siastic about it. Governor Goodrich, of Indiana, one of the directing heads of the American Relief administration, reports a meeting which he attended in Moscow. Certain Communist orators attempted to arouse interest in the Internationale but the response was meager. Then a young Russian workman arose and said: "Why talk about other countries and what we should do for them? I am not an Internationalist. The Third Internationale means nothing to me. I am a Russian and I stand for Russia."

The sentiment was cheered to the echo by the audience.

Lenin would like to have a world-revolution on Communistic lines. Theoretically, he may plan for it, but practically it is not likely to happen because human nature is against it.

Of course the Russian premier is a thoroughgoing materialist in his philosophy. Mud and motion are everything. All history and experience are based upon the struggle for existence. There are no moral or spiritual forces to be considered. They are figments of the

imagination. Social control, therefore, must be economic, not moral.

Jesus has a very different point of view. The great battlefield of life is within and the significant forces that must be reckoned with are spiritual. Deep down under the conventional and material surface of life are unmet needs and unanswered questions. These are the real sources of life's dissatisfaction and unrest. They cannot be met by bread and work. Man cannot live by bread alone, nor does his life consist in the abundance of the things that he possesses. It is these profounder needs of life according to Christianity which must be satisfied before the storm of economic and social unrest can be permanently appeased.

Lenin is seeking to save humanity by imposing upon it a new system of economic and political organization. Jesus is seeking to save men by imparting to them a new inward attitude toward life and toward one another. He insists that there is not likely to be outward happiness and peace until there is inward rightness of relation between God and

man. Christianity, of course, is in sympathy with every intelligent and worthy movement that seeks to improve the outward situation, but its emphasis is upon the inward attitude.

It is very clear that these two points of view are radically different. They approach the uplift of humanity from different angles. They do not seem to be reconcilable. One or the other must ultimately prevail. I can only record my conviction that Jesus is right and that his method of redemption and his principles must ultimately triumph to the exclusion of the other point of view. Jesus is the more practical and will in the end demonstrate his supremacy as the Master of men who knows what is in man as Lenin and his associates apparently do not. It may well be that there is value in the ideas for which the Russian premier stands, and through them Russia will perhaps make her contribution to the economic and political life of the world, but that the materialistic organization of society which he represents will be the final one I cannot believe for a moment.

"Our little systems have their day,
They have their day and cease to be.
They are but broken lights of Thee
And Thou, O Christ, art more than they."

IV

COUÉ

"If some magical transformation could be produced in men's ways of thinking of themselves and their fellows, most of the evils which now afflict society would vanish automatically." This sentence begins Mr. J. H. Robinson's intensely interesting study of *A Mind in the Making.* The old Stoic proverb is eternally true: "Men are tormented more by the opinions they have of things than by the things themselves." This is preeminently true of many modern problems.

If the Turk, for example, could come to have a different inward attitude toward the Christian; if he no longer thought of him as a wine-drinking, money-loving, power-grabbing infidel, and, if the Christian no longer thought of the Turk as a brutal, lustful, butchering monster—if each could come to think of the other as a brother with a somewhat different

point of view, the antagonisms of the Near East would disappear.

This does not ignore the hard and cruel facts of disagreeable race relations as they now exist in these quarters, but this changed way of thinking of one another would react in changing these outward facts. This is equally true of all the warring relationships between races and classes which now disturb the peace and order of the world. We spend a vast deal of time in trying to regulate human conduct through legislation and international agreements; but if we would deal with that which concerns the life of humanity most deeply, we must deal with its thinking. Outward relationships, however unsatisfactory, are not half so important as the inward education and direction of thought.

"One ship drives east and another drives west
By the very same wind that blows;
Its the set of the sail and not the gale
That determines the way she goes.
Like the waves of the sea are the winds of fate
As we travel along through life,
It's the set of the soul that determines the goal
And not the storm or the strife."

It is indeed true that "day by day in every way" we become more like the thoughts and images within us, which are the real architects of our destinies and our dispositions. It makes all the difference in the world whether one group of ideas or another becomes the dominant center of our thinking. Here, for example, is one who has accustomed himself to think in terms of certain practical commercial standards of value. His mind reverts instinctively to his investments. They are the last thing he thinks about at night and the first thing his awakening thought turns to in the morning. Here is another who has allowed evil suggestions and unholy images to become the dominant center of his thinking. Whenever his mind is relieved from the pressure of daily routine, his thoughts revert to the ideas associated with vice, lust, and crime. It is almost inevitable that he should become a degenerate or a criminal. Another dwells upon his physical ills and handicaps, his loneliness and his dread of the future, his thoughts dropping at free intervals into the worn groove of self-pity

and fear until he becomes a neurotic invalid. It is within the power of any individual, by utilizing the law of suggestion and repetition, to hold the mind to certain lines of thinking until he has created what Professor James called many years ago "an habitual center of thought and energy."

Some years ago a gentleman of my acquaintance passed through a serious ordeal. It came in the shape of an opportunity which strongly appealed to him but would have involved a compromise with his own high sense of honor and integrity. After it was all over, he told me something of how he had dealt with it. Every night before he went to sleep and every morning before he began the day and at intervals through his working hours he kept saying to himself, "I must be as true as steel." That single phrase, "as true as steel," kept running in his mind until it created in his own thought a condition which made it impossible for him to yield.

This is exactly the principle which today we are associating with the name of

a pleasant little Frenchman, Monsieur Coué, whose simple formula, "Day by day in every way I am getting better and better," has been repeated in recent months by thousands of people in France, England, and America.

Who Is Coué?

He was the son of poor parents who were unable to give him opportunities of advanced education. It is said by some that he did take a course in physical science in the university and that he would gladly have gone on to fit himself to become a physician. He was unable, however, to finance the six long years of necessary training so he contented himself with a shorter course in pharmacy and became a druggist in the neighborhood of Nancy. He seems, however, to have been more interested in people and in the working of their minds than he was in the selling of his drugs. Among those who came to him for advice and suggestions concerning their several ills, he discovered that a few drops of distilled

water and pills rolled out of bread were quite as effective in producing cures as the usual remedies prescribed for such ailments. Meanwhile he was an interested observer of the work of certain famous French physicians who opened in Nancy a free clinic for treatment by hypnotic suggestion. A four-dollar correspondence course advertised by American hypnotists also increased his knowledge and deepened his interest.

Thinking and experimenting along these lines, he isolated and identified the principle of auto- or self-suggestion. He found this to be the force of which hypnotic suggestion was simply one application. By repeated experiment he convinced himself that this force could be used with beneficial results in the healing of most of the ills which flesh is heir to and that it could be educated. For some twenty years now he has been conducting a clinic in Nancy. Just before the war it had become very popular and he was treating on the average one hundred persons a day. The war naturally broke into the routine of his work, but during

the last two or three years there has been a widespread revival of interest in his method.

His spirit is apparently altogether admirable. He is simple, modest, and kindly, but has about him a quiet self assurance which commands respect and obedience. He vigorously opposes any idea that he is a miracle-worker and insists that he is merely assisting people to utilize the helpful laws of the mind's action. One thing that especially commends him to us is the fact that he has not commercialized his knowledge or skill. His clinics are free to all who may come without money and without price.

Many interesting sketches of his seances or clinics at Nancy have been written for American newspaper and magazine readers. People of all ranks and conditions come to him. They fill his consulting room, sitting about in informal fashion. When he enters he greets them with his kindly, cheerful manner asking some simple questions about the nature of their malady; giving a bit of practical

advice and urging them to cease thinking of themselves as ill or maimed or rheumatic, but to imagine themselves whole and sound—in short to think of themselves as they wish to be. Then, taking a position in the center of the room, he repeats certain general directions and formulas all of which are so simple and childlike that one is inclined to be amused that they should be taken seriously. Perhaps, however, this is one secret of his skill. All of us who are concerned with the moral and physical health of humanity as teachers, educators, and reformers are inclined to be too complex or verbose to reach the average mind that we seek to help. We multiply words to no profit. We use technical formulas and terms which many do not understand. We obscure plain and simple truths by a vast amount of verbal drapery. Perhaps many of us could learn an advantageous lesson from Coué in this particular. A few plain truths clearly phrased and frequently repeated would eventually get across where much of our vague and expansive teaching fails of arrival.

Coué's Theory

In order to understand his point of view we must remember that our mental life seems to be double-barreled. This fact is not only confirmed by psychologists but has been the theme of much literature, such as Goethe's *Faust*, Stevenson's *Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* and Tennyson's "Two Voices." Art and the drama are fond of dwelling upon it. There is a conscious self and an unconscious or instinctive self. The latter takes care of the functions of the body, such as the operations of digestion and nourishment. For the most part we are unaware of it, but occasionally, in an emergency, it will surge into the foreground of our mental life and cause us to act or speak in a way which we hardly recognize as ourselves. When the moment is passed we can scarcely explain the situation.

This unconscious self M. Coué assures us is open to conscious suggestion. If I speak to you sharply or suddenly, saying "Look out!" you instinctively

dodge or cringe or put up your hand in self-defense. You did not have time to think. It was this instinctive self that takes care of you which acted for your protection. This was the result of suggestion from the outside. It is possible for us to consciously educate this instinctive self by suggestions of our own. It is particularly responsive to such suggestion when we are most completely relaxed, when we are half asleep at night or half awake in the morning. Hence the value of using the suggested formula "Every day in every way" at these particular periods.

There is nothing new about this. The most original and creative ideas that come to us frequently pop up into our consciousness, not as the result of any reasoned process of thinking but in some relaxed moment of dreamy reverie. I have known a number of individuals who kept a bit of paper and pencil at the head of the bed that they might catch and hold these fresh and suggestive thoughts that come to them out of the deeps of this unconscious mind.

The only original contribution which Mr. Coué has made to our knowledge of the mind's action is his insistence that this suggestive education of the unconscious self must come by appealing to the imagination rather than to the will. We have all discovered how difficult it is to will ourselves into some desirable course of action. The effort to will ourselves to sleep is a common example. It usually results in wider wakefulness. In Mr. Coué's method the will must be relaxed and inoperative. But the imagination must be astir. We are to picture ourselves in the condition that we want to be—well or happy or successful. By this process of visualizing what we desire the unconscious self is stimulated to bring it about.

Speaking out of personal experience, I have long found it helpful when I had some particularly difficult task to fulfill —one that I was inclined to dread—to quietly visualize myself in the situation. The mere act of doing so is a distinct help in preparing for it. Mr. Coué is undoubtedly helping us to realize what a

power for good suggestive imagination may become in our physical and mental development.

Christianity and Couéism

When we approach this matter from the Christian point of view we see that Christianity is in general agreement with the principles of Couéism. The emphasis of Christian teaching is upon the importance of the inner thought-life of the soul. It is the one thing about us that is most worth while, and upon this inward correctness of attitude depends the rightness of all outward adjustments and relationships. "As a man thinketh in his heart, so is he" is a saying older than Christianity. "Whatsoever things are true, whatsoever things are honest, whatsoever things are just, whatsoever things are pure, whatsoever things are lovely, whatsoever things are of good report; if there be any virtue, and if there be any praise, think on these things."

Jesus rebuked the religious and ecclesiastical authorities of his generation because their interest was all centered

in the performance of outward rites and the fulfillment of outward laws. Whereas, it was "from within, out of the heart, that there proceed evil thoughts, murders, adulteries, and every evil thing." On more than one occasion his healing of a physical infirmity seemed to be the result of an appeal or suggestion to the inner life. "Thy sins be forgiven thee." "Thy faith hath made thee whole." In discussing the moral life of man Jesus said, "Ye have heard that it hath been said by those of old, Thou shalt not kill, but I say unto you that whosoever shall say to his brother, Thou fool, is a murderer at heart." The inward attitude of disregard and contempt for human life that would prompt a man to call his brother a fool —this according to Jesus is the real source of outward crime and broken law. Perhaps the whole mission of Christ might be summed up as an effort to get men to think like God; to look out on life, its duties and relationships, through the eyes of God.

At this point, however, the teaching of Jesus parts company with the teaching

of Coué. The latter, together with many modern teachers of practical psychology, are interested only in the mechanics of the mind's action. They show how the wheels go round, and in so far as they make clear to us the laws of our mental operations and teach us to utilize these laws more perfectly, we are greatly in their debt; but to Jesus the mind is more than a machine. In his teaching there is an immortal personality involved in the conception of this inner life, a divine spirit which uses the mind as a musician might use an instrument; a spirit which must be brought into harmony with the ultimate will and purpose which we call God. Couéism followed too literally would lead us to the assumption that we are only mechanisms articulated in the larger machine of the universe. But Christianity insists upon personality and freedom.

While Jesus certainly did not ignore the place of the imagination in the development of life—for he was constantly appealing to it—yet his emphasis was clearly upon the will. It would not be

safe or wise for any of us to drift along with relaxed purposes upon the current of imagination. The oak and iron and fiber of character are in the last analysis to be found in the will to health and happiness and righteousness. That will to righteousness is the very essence of the Christian conception of personality triumphant over all adverse outward conditions.

It is the one who has thus learned to trust the supremacy of his own soul who is the real victor over physical ills and limitations. He is not afraid of to-morrow; he cannot be permanently injured by accident, disappointed by failure, discouraged by illness, or killed by death; whatever storms may beat upon the outward coasts of his experience, his soul within is like a quiet garden, full of shelter and of fountains.

V

LLOYD GEORGE

It is a significant fact that of the six names that have been chosen for this discussion, only one of them, David Lloyd George, is actively and publicly associated with the Christian Church. This, of course, may mean much or little. Not all the Christians of the world are within the fold of the church; nor is a man's Christianity necessarily the better because of an open and public confession of allegiance. It is the spirit of Christ which is the real test of Christianity. Perhaps Gandhi of India, according to this measurement, is more of a Christian than any of the others. It does indicate, however, that the leadership of the world's thought and life is not as closely identified with organized Christianity as we should like to see it. Realizing this, some have been bitterly disappointed in the Christian Church during the last

decade. They complain that in spite of its ideals of peace and good will, it was powerless to prevent the tragedy of the war which has wrecked Europe. Divided and hesitating, it had no contribution to make, officially at least, toward remedying the situation. It has consoled the bereaved and strengthened the dying and instituted various works of philanthropy, but for any systematic attempt to evolve justice between nations and classes by the application of the principles of Christ, men have too often looked to it in vain.

There appear, however, to be some sound reasons for this situation. As a matter of fact, the church is not a separate and distinctive body. It is, rather, an interpenetrating force. From our Protestant point of view, at least, it is not a rigid organization. It is, rather, a spiritual power slowly pervading human society. We shall never again, I fancy, see the church dictating a political or economic program to the world. Do not misunderstand me. I hope and pray that we may see Christians dictating such a program, but that the church as an

organization should do it is not advisable. That is, not unless we wish to return to the hierarchical conception of Christianity as a temporal power, and I do not believe any of us would choose to return to that period in the development of religion. The darkest days in the history of the church were those when the largest measure of political and economic power was centered in the hands of an ecclesiastical court. It is quite possible, therefore, that while outwardly and visibly the Christian organization is not at the forefront, as we might wish to see it, the spirit of Christianity, slowly saturating and changing social ideals, is really doing just what the Master said it would, "leavening the whole lump."

His Religious Antecedents

Lloyd George has never hesitated to express his devotion and indebtedness to the little Nonconformist group of Welsh Baptists under whose influence and early training his own ideals were formed. On more than one occasion he has said that he owes more to the chapel than to the

school or any other institution with which he has come in contact. His first teacher, his uncle, was not only the village cobbler but also the preacher in the Nonconformist Chapel.

His first political mentor was the president of a small Baptist theological school in the neighborhood. His first training ground for parliamentary debate was the village blacksmith's shop, where the doctrines of the Christian Church were nightly discussed by rural theologians. He only just escaped the Christian ministry himself and has never ceased to love the Welsh hymns and simple services in the Nonconformist chapels.

His present religious outlook is, of course, more generally Christian than sectarian, but he has always championed the rights of the Nonconformist minorities. About his religious faith there is the rugged simplicity which reminds one of Lincoln's faith as it expressed itself under the pressure of responsibility which came to him in the Civil War. If Lloyd George is the greatest figure in English history since Gladstone, as his

biographers have insisted, it is certainly significant that both of these strong men were rooted and grounded in religious principle and Christian faith.

His father was a school-teacher in the city of Manchester when David was born on the 17th of January, 1863. Unfortunately, his father's sturdy character was not matched with rugged health. He died when his children were still very young, leaving the mother with a little family of three and very slender financial resources. So meager was her income that Mrs. George found it necessary to appeal to her brother, Richard Lloyd. He lived in a picturesque little village in the north of Wales between the Snowden mountains and the shores of Cardigan Bay. He was a tall, upstanding man, sober-minded and kindly and with a reputation for integrity which commanded general respect. He cobbled the village shoes during the week and expounded the claims of the Christian gospel in the Baptist chapel on Sundays. Being a bachelor he brought his sister and her little family and installed them in his own humble

cottage. Henceforth he became indeed a father to the fatherless, training them and directing their education with all the affection and interest of a fond parent.

By dint of much economy he had saved a few hundred pounds against his old age. But when it came to the point of deciding upon the future of his promising young nephew, David, he spared nothing of his treasure. The boy was educated to become a solicitor, and at twenty-one he had finished his studies and was admitted to practice. But so thoroughly depleted was the family treasury that between them they could not raise enough to buy the solicitor's gown demanded by the custom of English courts. Young David had visited London when he was seventeen and, of course, he went to the House of Parliament. In his *Journal* he noted the fact that he was disappointed in what he saw and added a queer comment: "I will not say that I look down upon the house of commons with the same feeling that William the Conqueror looked upon England when he visited Edward the Confessor—as the

region of his future activities and triumphs." It was intended for a joke, but it was a joke that proved to be a prophecy.

A Case That Made Him Famous

The audacity of the young solicitor soon attracted local attention. It was quite the custom of the courts of those days to intimidate and browbeat young lawyers who were pleading their first cases. But Lloyd George was not afraid of any magistrates. Any attempt to intimidate him resulted in a comeback which injured the dignity of the court. The interests of the under dog have always appealed to him, and from the first he was fond of defending those who were weak and helpless.

When he was twenty-five years old he took a case which made him famous. An old quarryman, living at the foot of the Snowdens died, and in his last hours requested that he should be buried by the side of his daughter, whose grave was in the cemetery of the English Church. The rector would not consent to this request because the old gentleman was a Noncon-

formist. He insisted that he could only be buried in a remote part of the churchyard reserved for strangers and suicides. Neighbors and friends, greatly disturbed, sought the advice of Lloyd George. It was just the sort of thing he enjoyed. After looking up the legal status of the matter he authorized them to carry out the wishes of the old quarryman. If necessary, they were to break down the gates of the cemetery. They followed his instructions. The church authorities were scandalized. A suit at law ensued. Under the eloquent pleas of the young solicitor the jury awarded him a verdict, but the judge set it aside on a technical point. Not to be defeated, however, Lloyd George immediately appealed to the Lord Chief Justice in London and obtained a decision which was like a Charter of Rights for the despised Nonconformist.

The same year, 1888, he married Maggie Owen, the daughter of a farmer living in the neighborhood, and they have journeyed happily and prosperously together throughout the succeeding years.

He was deeply interested in all of the political interests of the time and at the age of twenty-seven was elected from his district to Parliament by a small majority of liberal votes. It was assumed by many that this would be the end of him, as he did not appear to possess either the education or the experience which would warrant his occupying so important a position. But he measured up to the occasion. He continued to devote himself to the interests of the under dog. He never knew when he was beaten in debate. His aggressive combativeness drew upon him the fire of antagonists. But they soon learned to attack him with great caution, for his sharp and witty retorts became famous. Some of them will go down in Parliamentary history. For example: He was urging the necessity for granting a larger measure of Home Rule to Wales as well as to Ireland. "Yes," said one of his opponents angrily, "I suppose we will have to grant Home Rule to Hell." Instantly came back the answer, "Quite right, quite right, let every man speak up for his own country."

He became a member of the ministry of Campbell-Bannerman in 1906. Ever since that time, until his resignation a few months ago, he has been in the government. First as president of the Board of Trade, then as chancellor of the exchequer, and finally as prime minister, a position which he has held with almost autocratic power for six years. All of the other allied statesmen of the war period went down to defeat before his leadership showed any sign of weakening.

Mr. Lloyd George breaks all the conventional rules for success. He is unbusinesslike in his methods, unsystematic in his use of time. He makes important engagements and forgets to keep them. Correspondence is a burden to him and he hates letter-writing. His biographers assert that the only way you can get a definite reply from him is to inclose two postal cards, on one of which you have written "yes" and on the other "no." Even then he is quite likely to mail you both cards leaving you as much in the dark as ever. His plans are great, effective and far-reaching, but his mastery of

detail is lacking. He knows enough, however, to surround himself with those who can work out the minutiæ of his schemes.

His Gift of Adaptation

When one looks for the secret of his long continuance in office during the stormy days when changing public opinion has swept many other statesmen into oblivion, we find it, I think, in his gift of adapting himself and his opinions to these swiftly changing situations. His ability to compromise enabled him to reconcile antagonistic points of view, bridge apparently impassable chasms, and thus hold together in a coalition government parties that had very little in common.

As the master of a sailing vessel on the high seas finds it necessary to readjust the spread of his canvas and the course of his vessel to every slightest change of wind and tide and current, so Lloyd George is a master of the art of political navigation. This may be considered both an element of strength and of weakness according to the point of view of the

critic. To some who are more consistently inclined, it looks like time-serving, to others it is playing the game of practical politics with efficiency. Inconsistency certainly never seems to disturb Lloyd George or cause him to hesitate. One cannot discover that he has ever pursued a very well-defined plan. He has frequently shifted his ground and appears to be more of an opportunist than one whose decisions are the result of sound or reasoned conviction. He is, to be sure, truly democratic and liberal in spirit. His political principles, however, are not so important to him as to make him in any sense a party man. He is a free lance and believes in keeping the party machine on his side.

If we are right in this attempt to characterize the statesmanship of Mr. Lloyd George, how does it bear the scrutiny of Christian principles? Out of the welter of the world's confusion there is to come, we believe, a new type of statesmanship. It will ask a new question when it comes to determining public policy. It will no longer be: Is this politic? Is it to our

advantage? Will it contribute to our national interests? But: Is this right? Is it fair to all? Is it honest and above board? Intrigue, secretiveness, and deceitful diplomacy must go. The old description of a diplomat ran something like this: He must be able to speak three languages. First; French, which has always been the language of European diplomacy. Second; he must be able to speak nothing. Third; he must be able to speak lies. To say one thing and mean another is at the bottom of much of the wickedness of international relationships.

With all respect for the personal Christian character of Mr. Lloyd George, he has not yet seen the vision of the new Christian statesmanship. In the council at Versailles he insisted upon secrecy and did not permit the public to know what was going on behind the closed doors of the council chamber. Moreover, he encouraged the unjust division in the council which resulted in the domination of what was called "the big four" over the smaller nationalities whose interests were

just as vital and important as those of greater nations. It is to be regretted that the Christian spirit of fairness and mutual service did not triumph over the petty and contemptibly selfish interests which have practically wrecked the Treaty of Versailles.

If there is one quality which Jesus insists upon more than another, it is sincerity. His most severe arraignment was reserved for those who deceived themselves and others, who made clean the outside of the cup and the platter—"whited sepulchers" he called them. Their hypocrisy never failed to draw his fire. Many of the diplomats and statesmen of the old school fall under this condemnation. Their ideas and practices still conform to the teaching of Machiavelli. But a new age is upon us. The old order based on selfishness is going to pieces about as fast as it can. There is a crying need for leaders who will insist upon the application of Christian principles not only to personal character and private relationships, but to national character and public policies. The

statesmen of this new day have not yet arrived. Some are wondering if they ever will appear, but others of greater faith can see them in the offing.

VI

EINSTEIN

The names chosen for these discussions were not selected at random. They represent in an outstanding way the leaders of the world's thought and action at the present moment. We have been trying to interpret them in the light of what we believe to be Christian standards of truth and duty.

One of them, Gandhi of India, prophet, patriot and agitator, is a symbol of a new day among the inarticulate millions of Asia. Three of them, Clemenceau, Lenin, and Lloyd George, are practical statesmen who are largely responsible for the political policies which now dominate the troubled life of Europe. M. Coué is the representative of a type of rather mechanical thinking by which multitudes are trying to escape from the outward confusion of a disturbed world to the inward peace and freedom of their own spirits.

The last of this group, Albert Einstein, is a mathematician, a physicist, and a philosopher. He is credited by many with having made the greatest contribution to creative thought of any man of his generation. It is predicted that future judgment will assign him a place with such creative minds as that of Copernicus, Galileo, and Newton.

Some of us, I fancy, may be chuckling to ourselves and asking with amused curiosity how the purely mathematical formulas of Einstein and his physical theories of the universe can possibly lend themselves to any Christian or even religious interpretation. It is just this point, however, in which I am interested. Otherwise I would not venture for a moment to invade a field where only a technical expert can be at home. If it is true, as has been asserted, that not more than ten of his contemporaries really understand Mr. Einstein's theory, I certainly would not venture to be classed as one of them.

Professor Herbert Scott Palmer has recently said that "We may now assert the reality of spirit as candidly as we

have hitherto asserted the reality of matter." The spiritual world can no longer claim a monopoly of mystery. It appears now that the electro-tonic theory of matter reeks with mystery. What are electrons anyway? They are not matter and yet matter is composed of them. The material world is no longer the rigid, tangible, permanent reality that we have assumed. In the modern, scientific conception, it is apparently approaching more and more the point where it is almost identical with spirit.

To all this Einstein's theories have contributed in no small degree. Relativity seems likely to produce remarkable results outside the little world of science if the trend of thought among learned men counts for anything. Dr. Wildon Carr, professor of philosophy at London University, is quoted in an interview in the London Daily News as saying: "I think that the religious importance of the acceptance of the Einstein theory is enormous. In fact, I should go so far as to say that relativity can only be understood in terms of an immanent God, a

reality which in its very nature is life and consciousness. What strikes me about it is that the old idea of a material or mechanical universe as a necessary postulate of thought is wiped out. Thought is now seen to be the fundamental reality of the universe." Materialism as a world view seems to be toppling to its fall.

Creative Thinking

Creative thinking is rare. Few of us can lay claim to doing much of it. At long intervals we do have moments of illuminative thought when we see things in a new and meaningful light. That is exactly what creative thought is. It makes things look different from what they were before. It gives us an entirely new point of view. It has been pointed out that these illuminative moments are frequently the result not so much of long processes of reasoning as of sudden bursts of insight and keen observation.

Four hundred and fifty years ago Galileo, a Pisan lad of seventeen years, wandered into the cathedral in his native

town. While listening idly to the service, he happened to notice the swinging of the great lamps fastened by long chains to the ceiling. Some were swinging in a short arc and some in a longer one. He fell to wondering whether it took the same length of time for the lamp to swing in either arc. He tried to figure it out by counting his pulse, which was the only timepiece he had. Out of that simple observation grew the marvelous conception of an orderly universe regulated by law. The story of Newton and the falling apple is familiar to every school-boy. Why did the apple fall? Why did it not fall upward, or at an angle rather than downward and with what speed did it fall? Would its descent have been more rapid if it had possessed greater mass? Out of this curious questioning came the Newtonian theory of gravitation as a force holding the universe together and operating by certain fixed laws the formulas for which were carefully worked out.

Tradition has it that out of a somewhat similar experience came Einstein's gen-

eral theory of relativity. From the window of an apartment in Berlin he saw an unfortunate man fall from the roof of a neighboring house. Running to the spot he discovered that the man had fallen into a pile of soft rubbish and was apparently unhurt. On being asked how it felt to fall, he replied that there was no feeling about it; that he was conscious of no weight pulling him down. From that incidental observation came the new and revolutionary conception of gravitation, not as a force but as a quality of the universe, with all the attendant changes in our commonly accepted ideas of things.

Who Is Albert Einstein?

He is a Jew, another example of the brilliant and creative mind which that interesting race has so often produced. He was born in March, 1879, at Ulm in Germany. His father was a business man. His preliminary steps in education were taken in the schools of Munich. There he was apparently regarded by his teachers as a dull and uninteresting boy.

He did not have a retentive memory. He lacked clearness and fluency in expressing himself. His only special interest was the study of higher mathematics in which he outdistanced others. At sixteen he went to Switzerland, where he failed in the entrance examination to the Federal Polytechnic College, but after further preliminary work he managed to enter and took a course in mathematics and physics. His interest was never very keen in the routine work of his subjects; indeed, he appeared to doubt the accuracy of many accepted theories.

At eighteen years of age he sent to his instructors a dissertation which contained the germs of his unique contribution to science and philosophy. After graduating he accepted a small post as technical expert in the Swiss government at Berne, continuing meanwhile his own researches. At twenty-seven his theories were more fully given to the world. They attracted the attention of some distinguished persons. He lectured for a time in the University of Zurich and was then called to Berlin to become a member

of the research faculty in an institution corresponding to our Carnegie Foundation for research work at Washington.

At the outbreak of the war he incurred the displeasure of official Germany by protesting against what he considered the criminally mistaken policy of the imperial government. He refused to sign the manifesto issued at the beginning of the war by numerous German scholars and savants. Ever since he has been *persona non grata* at Berlin. He has recently been in Japan and may make his home in Jerusalem, where, as an ardent Zionist, he is deeply interested in the establishment of a Jewish university. He is not the shriveled up person that we usually associate with such abstract thinking. He has been happy in his own home life; fond of music and of out of doors sports with his two sons.

What is the nature of his revolutionary ideas? Not being either a mathematician nor a physicist, I cannot answer this question in detail. The substance of it, however, is clear enough. Much that we have hitherto considered fixed and

absolute categories of our thinking, Einstein has proved to be merely relative and incidental. Space, time, matter, and motion—these are no longer the final and unalterable entities that we supposed.

Relativity and Religion

Nothing is clearer than that different people have different opinions about exactly the same thing. These opinions are affected by individual bias and are relative to the personal standpoint. If a group of us were to witness an accident, on returning home we would probably tell as many different stories as there were observers present. Let us suppose that a mechanic, an electrician, and an artist attend together the annual automobile show. They examine carefully the various stock cars which are on exhibition. Each one will see the car from a somewhat different angle. The mechanic will be primarily interested in the engine and the transmission. The electrician will be concerned with the electrical equipment, and the artist will have an eye for the lines of grace and beauty in the

body design and finishing. Each will go away with a somewhat different concept of the same car. But the real car, you say, is there on the floor of the exposition room. It may be so, but Mr. Einstein will tell you that if you can imagine the car going at the speed of 162,000 miles a second, it would be only half its present bulk and size. So there you are. Our hard-and-fast notions of reality begin to waver.

One or two other simple illustrations which have been used in this connection. Here is a vessel sailing west and on its deck a passenger walking east. Is he really moving or is he standing still? It depends upon your point of view. If you happen to be a fellow passenger on the same vessel, it will appear to you that he is moving, but if you are standing on the shore while the vessel passes by, he will seem to you to be standing still and marking time. If you wake up some morning in a Pullman car and glance out of the window, you may see another train passing on a parallel track. It is rather difficult for you to determine at once whether

it is your own train that is moving or the other train, or whether both trains are moving, one a little faster than the other. This suggests at least the significance of what Einstein means by relativity.

We began this series of studies with a reference to certain fixed standards of measurement whose accuracy has been scientifically determined, preserved as norms by which the scales and measurements of the nation may be corrected. But now comes one who casts serious doubt upon the absoluteness of any of our earthly standards of time and space; suggesting that they are all relative and intimating that the only ultimate reality is beyond these familiar categories. The heart of what I am trying to say is this: These new theories of special and general relativity seem quite clearly to assert that the actual reality which underlies all we touch, taste, see, or hear and which reaches beyond all the manifestations we experience, is neither spacial nor temporary nor material, but a blend of all three, which is very near akin to an infinite and eternal spirit. It

certainly leaves us not far from the Christian conception of an immanent God in whom we live and move and have our being.

Science, philosophy, and religion are getting very close together here. Christian idealism and theism are intimately wrapped up with all that we have just considered. If, as has been reported, the communistic authorities of Russia, whose theory of government is based upon materialistic philosophy, have debarred the ideas of Einstein from Russian education, it means that Russian leaders see how certainly these ideas tend toward the idealism and the theism which they deny.

Is it too much to say that this leads us directly toward Jesus' point of view? Was he not always trying to lead men behind the scenes, to put them in touch with the reality which transcends material, spacial, and temporal limits? The whole trend of his teaching was to show men that things are not what they seem.

Indeed, the more familiar one becomes with the teaching of the New Testament, the more certainly he feels that Jesus

wished to relieve us from the bondage of a mechanical universe and to teach us that the reign of law is not so hard and unyielding as it seems. He shows that the world is plastic like clay in the hands of the great Potter.

Half a century ago some men thought the discovery of the uniformity of nature and the reign of law had silenced Jesus. "The great Companion is dead," said Mr. Clifford. There is nothing more noticeable than the pathetic cry of despair and doubt which can be detected in some of the literature of that period. Take this for a sample:

"They have taken away my Lord;
They have shattered the one great Hope;
They have left us alone to cope
With our terrible selves.
The strength of immortal love;
The comfort of millions that weep;
Prayer and the cross we adore—
All is lost! There is no one above;
We are left like the beasts that creep—
They have taken away my Lord."

But the mood of our thinking is changing. The newer science has shown that

what we thought was rigid is plastic. The facts we supposed to be final, turn out to be only provisional. A half century ago men placed the uniformity of nature over against the freedom of God and supposed they had dispensed with prayer and providence. But we have come to see that the universe is the garment of God, the changing expression of his thought; that he is in and through and above it all, God over all, blessed forever.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

GANDHI

Newspaper and magazine articles.

"Mahatma Gandhi," by Edmund Candler, Atlantic Monthly for July, 1922.

CLEMENCEAU

Clemenceau, The Man and His Time, by H. M. Hyndman. Frederick A. Stokes Company.

"The Big Four and Others of the Peace Conference," by Robert Lansing, Saturday Evening Post.

"Georges Clemenceau," by Sisley Huddleston, Atlantic Monthly for December, 1922.

LENIN

The New Policies of Soviet Russia, by Nicolai Lenin. Kerr & Co.

Lenin, The Man and His Work, by A. R. Williams.

Lenin, by Aldanov Landau.

The Russian Pendulum, by Arthur Bullard. The Macmillan Company.

COUÉ

Self-Mastery Through Conscious Autosuggestion, by Emile Coué.

Emile Coué, The Man and His Work, by H. V. Macnaughton.

LLOYD GEORGE

Lloyd George, The Man and His Story, by Frank Dilnot. Harper & Brothers.

The Prime Minister, by Harold Spender. Hodder & Stoughton.

Mirrors of Downing Street. G. P. Putnam's Sons.

The Big Four, by Robert Lansing.

"The Genoa Conference. Lloyd George at Work," by Herbert Sidebotham, in Atlantic Monthly for August, 1922.

EINSTEIN

Easy Lessons in Einstein, by Edwin E. Slosson. Harcourt, Brace & Howe.

The Einstein Theory of Relativity, by H. A. Lorentz. Brentano's.

An Introduction to the Theory of Relativity, by L. Bolton. Dutton.

"The Einstein Theory," in Vol. IV of *Outline of Science*, by J. Arthur Thomson. G. P. Putnam's Sons.

GTU Library
3 2400 00655 7635

GTU Library
2400 Ridge Road
Berkeley, CA 94709
For renewals call (510) 649-2500
All items are subject to recall